

Draft Meeting Notes		Department of Health Office of Environmental Health & Safety	
		Meeting Name <i>4-5-05</i>	
Facilitator:	Nancy Bernard	Note Taker(s):	Nancy Bernard Mark Soltman
Attendees:	Paul Clark, Moses Lake SD; Julie Awbrey, Spokane Regional Health District; Don Leaf, WSEHA; John Richards, OSPI; Ned Therien, SBOH; Scott LaBar, ESD 112; Karen VanDusen, UW; Greg Bawden, WSSDA; Shirley Carstens, SNOW; John Wolpers, EHD, Kittitas CHD; Claire Olsovsky, IEH; Mary Sue Linville, WSRMP/WASBO; James Green, community; Mark Cooper, parent; Bill Chaput, CEFPI; Ed Foster, WIFIS; Jim Kerns, ESD 101; Kitty Johnson-Woods, EVSD		
Absent:	Steve Barber, DSFM; Paul Clark, MLSD/WAMOA; Mike Cotey, L&I; Dave DeLong, TPCHD; Scott Emry, LWSD; Gary Jefferis, ESD/WAMOA; Thelma Simon, Parent	Guests:	Angela Storey, WTC

AGENDA ITEMS	DISCUSSION
Introductions Review Agenda Review notes from 3-15	No corrections or comments to March 15 notes.
ACTION	
Chemicals Continued from prior meeting.	<p>Discussion on proposed language for A. -Hazardous chemicals is a more appropriate term, more inclusive.</p> <p>C: can relate across the board, including classrooms. Would it work as a rule? Yes, L&I does this all the time. Is there a substitute available, hazardous waste driving this. Great idea in practice. Can have problems, needs to be related to the job. Still able to perform. Will the health official and the maintenance person agree on what this means? How labor intensive is necessary? Argues for rule and then guidance. Policy directions. Proposed language from Mark. Discussion over the enforceability of this. Language issue. Risk is defined by what is on the MSDS. Something in the rule to give intent. We can now say that we want chemicals safely used without high hazardous. Is there a guidance document on what are the least toxic products? Vote on new language.</p>
ACTION	Voted on A & C.

AGENDA ITEMS	DISCUSSION
CCA Treated Wood used in Playground Structures	<p>-Should this cover just playground structures?</p> <p>-Treated wood could be used structurally in buildings where it would not be in contact with soil. There are substitutes available.</p> <p>-Are we worried about the environment, or just children? If just children, then playgrounds and landscaping. Otherwise, in general.</p> <p>-Treated wood exposed to touch by children is our main concern. Playgrounds and landscape structures.</p> <p>-There are health concerns with other treated woods besides CCA.</p> <p>-New installation, repair or modification means that you don't use it, not removing in general. Do we want other vocabulary? Go beyond CCA? Develop guidance with specifics?</p> <p>Language proposals from Mark.</p> <p>Need a rule and then guidance.</p> <p>B: Notification requirement: Concern that legislation is dealing only with the West side, not the eastside. Language could be a can of worms and cost the state a great deal. The intent is not to look for every source of contamination, but to notify parents and communities when issues are known. If the LHJ is aware of any area-wide contamination, they should inform the schools that it exists. Who is making this determination? Based on what? Difficulties between LHJs on the eastside and ECY on interpretation. If you wait until you find Arsenic & Lead in children, too late. -</p> <p>Need to deal with preexisting conditions. Phase 1 study will get to new areas.</p> <p>Proposed language:</p> <p>-Difficulty with "past practices" – too broad. Reasonably be expected to cause health risks. Notification of parents of known, potential risks to parents.</p> <p>Mark separated proposals. B1 & B2</p> <p>C: EPA guidelines instead of DOH. Actually ECY. Definition of mitigation and remediation confusion.</p>
ACTION	Vote: A, B1, B2, & C.
Integrated Pest Management	<p>-Existing state law mandates state agencies use IPM – we should be consistent with its language.</p> <p>-Addressing an identified problem from pests.</p> <p>-Need to spell out specifics. EPA guidance does exist. It is a case by case situation.</p> <p>-How do you resolve differences between LHJ interpretation and the school district?</p> <p>-K12 helps to mitigate this. There is existing RCW language about what IPM means in this state. Schools are a public entity. Requiring IPM is appropriate. Set up to prevent health damage - also at times the environment – there is overlap. Certainly protects kids.</p>
ACTION	Vote on A.
Safety Concerns with Athletics, PE, and Sports	<p>Little discussion. Some concern that this needs to focus on equipment that is within the ability of the LHJ to inspect.</p>
ACTION	Vote on A & B.

AGENDA ITEMS	DISCUSSION	
First Aid/CPR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -clarification on language in A. C: -broad acknowledgment that there are risky situations. Staff already addressed under WISHA. Risks to students - curriculum committees are to address. - here may be areas not covered. Need a systems approach. -If this did make it into a rule, how would it be addressed? -We don't have in the current WAC any comprehensive requirement for a risk assessment. -Risk insurers do this. -This should be done at the teacher certification level. - Work with OSPI on this. -Ask a school to routinely assess risks. School based safety committees could do this. Training will be different for different specifics. Address in In-service. -Goes to the underlying approach of the whole RR. -Could have LHJ on the school safety committees. -L&I safety committees are for staff, not students. - Schools now also have safety committees around violence prevention. 	
ACTION	Vote on A, B, & C.	
HANDOUTS		NEXT MEETING
Decision Agenda from 3-15 & 4-5, Summary notes from 3-15, Agenda		None. We're finished.